

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT TACOMA

AMERICAN STRATEGIC INSURANCE CORP, a foreign insurer,

No. 3:23-CV-5461-RJB

**Plaintiff.**

VS.

**ORDER GRANTING AMENDED  
MOTION TO ENTER FINAL  
JUDGMENT**

JACOB JACKSON, individually, JACOB JACKSON and STACY JACKSON, husband and wife, INSPIRIT ATHLETICS, INC, a Washington For-Profit Corporation, d.b.a., STERLING ATHLETICS, SUMNER-BONNEY LAKE SCHOOL DISTRICT, a Municipal Corporation, JOHN DOE 1, individually, JOHN DOE 2, individually, JANE DOE 1, individually, JOHN DOE 3, individually, JOHN DOE 4, individually, and JANE DOE 2, individually, JANE DOE 20, as Guardian ad Litem for JOHN DOE 20, a minor, and, JANE DOE 20 and JOHN DOE 21, wife and husband,

## Defendants.

Having considered Plaintiff's Amended Motion to Enter Final Judgment, and being fully advised, that motion (Dkt. 85) is GRANTED.

Having further considered the pleadings filed regarding Plaintiff American Strategic Insurance Corp.'s ("ASIC") Motions for Summary Judgment (Dkts. 38-45 & 53-56), the Orders

1     Granting the Motions for Summary Judgment (Dkts. 46 & 57), and Plaintiff's Amended Motion  
2     to Enter Final Judgment (Dkt. 85), the Court makes the following Findings of Facts and  
3     Conclusions of Law and ORDERS:

4         1. Plaintiff ASIC's Motions for Summary Judgment (Dkts. 38 & 53) are  
5     GRANTED. The Court finds and concludes that Plaintiff does not owe a duty to defend or duty  
6     to indemnify Defendant Jacob Jackson for the claims asserted against him in the underlying  
7     lawsuits: (1) *John Doe 1, et al. v. Inspirit Athletics, Inc., et al.*, Pierce County Superior Court  
8     Case No. 22-2-09631-0 (“John Doe 1 Lawsuit”); (2) *John Doe 3, et al. v. Inspirit Athletics, Inc.,*  
9     *et al.*, Pierce County Superior Court Case No. 23-2-050532-0 (“John Doe 3 Lawsuit”); (3) *Jane*  
10     *Doe 20, as Guardian ad Litem for John Doe 20, et al. v. Inspirt Athletics, Inc., et al.*, Pierce  
11     County Superior Court Case No. 23-2-08692-4 (“John Doe 20 Lawsuit”).

12         2. Plaintiff ASIC's Motion for Summary Judgment (Dkt. 53) is GRANTED. The  
13     Court finds and concludes that Plaintiff does not owe a duty to defend or duty to indemnify  
14     Defendant Stacy Jackson for the claims asserted against her in the underlying lawsuit: *Jane Doe*  
15     *20, as Guardian ad Litem for John Doe 20, et al. v. Inspirt Athletics, Inc., et al.*, Pierce County  
16     Superior Court Case No. 23-2-08692-4 (“John Doe 20 Lawsuit”).

17         3. The Court finds and concludes that Defendants Stacy Jackson, Inspirt Athletics,  
18     Inc., John Doe 1, John Doe 2, Jane Doe 1, John Doe 3, John Doe 4, and Jane Doe 2 are bound by  
19     this Court's Orders Granting Motions for Summary Judgment and holding that ASIC does not  
20     owe a duty to defend or indemnify Jacob Jackson for the claims against him in the John Doe 1,  
21     John Doe 3 or John Doe 20 Lawsuits. Dkts. 46 & 57.

22         4. The Court finds and concludes that Defendants Jacob Jackson, Inspirt Athletics,  
23     Inc., John Doe 1, John Doe 2, Jane Doe 1, John Doe 3, John Doe 4, and Jane Doe 2 are bound by

this Court's Orders Granting Motions for Summary Judgment and holding that ASIC does not owe a duty to defend or indemnify Stacy Jackson for the claims against her in the John Doe 20 Lawsuit. Dkts. 46 & 57.

5. The Court further directs the Clerk to enter a final Judgment for Plaintiff, incorporating therein the foregoing Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, finding that costs of suit and attorney fees are not awarded, and closing the case.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 24th day of February, 2025.

Robert J. Bryan

ROBERT J. BRYAN  
United States District Judge